

## **REMARKS**

By this amendment, Claim 79 has been amended in the manner consistent with a telephone interview between Applicants' representatives and the Examiner regarding possible claim amendments as discussed further below. Upon entrance of this amendment, pending Claims 79, 80, 82, 86-93 and 95 will overcome all prior art rejections, and the application will be placed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the amendment is proper and should be entered. The amendment does not add any new matter to the application. For the reasons as set forth below and as expressed in the telephone interview, Applicants submit that upon entrance of the amendment, the application will be placed in condition for immediate allowance.

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner maintained a series of rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Caduff (US 7,315,767) in view of Bauer (US 6,322,963) and other references.<sup>1</sup> Applicants have pointed out in previous responses why the combination of Caduff and Bauer could not be made in a manner that would make Applicants' claimed invention obvious. In particular, Applicants have pointed out that neither Caduff nor Bauer either singly or in combination discloses or suggests the pair of injection and sensing electrodes which function in the manner of Applicants' claimed invention.

---

<sup>1</sup> As set forth herein, all of the outstanding rejections will be traversed in light of the amendments to independent Claim 79.


However, in a telephone interview with the Examiner, the Examiner maintained the position that the claim language did not exclude the prior art because it was not specified that each of the sensing electrodes was capable of sensing both of the injection electrodes which provides Applicants' claimed invention with a four-point detection system not disclosed or suggested in the prior art. Accordingly, without addressing the merits of the Examiner's arguments concerning the prior language of the claims, the present amendments make it clear that each of the sensing electrodes is adapted to detect the voltage from each of the injection electrodes.

As discussed in the Interview, these amendments thus clearly distinguish the claims from the cited Caduff and Bauer references, and the Examiner's rejections on the basis of these references, insofar as applied to the claims as amended, are respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that upon entrance of the present amendments, all outstanding rejections will be overcome, and the present application will be placed in condition for immediate allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2011



By: B. Aaron Schulman

Registration No.: 31,877

**STITES & HARBISON PLLC** ♦ 1199 North Fairfax St. ♦ Suite 900 ♦ Alexandria, VA 22314  
TEL: 703-739-4900 ♦ FAX: 703-739-9577 ♦ CUSTOMER NO. 000881